

Appln No. 09/721,862  
Amdt. Dated April 7, 2005  
Response to Office Action of February 10, 2005

7

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

We appreciate the Examiner's assistance in this matter in arranging an interview with Mr. Silverbrook. However, unfortunately, Mr. Silverbrook was unable to conform.

The Applicants have amended Page 1 of the specification to delete a paragraph and replace it with paragraph entitled "Cross-Reference to Related Applications". The Applicants have also updated the US applications numbers with the US issued patent numbers, where applicable. The Applicants submit that these amendments introduce no new matter.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 § USC 112***

Claims 8 to 14 and 21 to 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner has objected to the insertion of "the visible content and the invisible coded data are printed substantially simultaneously", the incorporation by reference not being valid, as the insertion was cited from USSN 09/575,195, of which, the instant application is not a continuation.

As part of this objection the Examiner refers to 37 CFR 1.60(b). We note however that this rule appears to have been deleted prior to the earliest filing date of the present application, and as a result of this the Applicant is having difficulty understanding the objection. However to prevent this issue stalling prosecution, claim 8 and the specification page 8, lines 22 to 30, have been amended to remove the term "substantially simultaneously".

In particular we believe that in any event the fact that the visible content and the invisible coded data are printed by the same printer effectively distinguishes over the cited art, as it is inherent that the printing is substantially simultaneously. This is supported by descriptions in the present specification including examples such as netpages being "printed at their point of consumption", thereby combining the "ease-of-use of paper with the timeliness and interactivity of an interactive medium" (page 6, lines 9 to 10), and wherein the tags, encoding coded data, are printed on ordinary paper (see page 8, lines 7 to 9).

Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the visible content and the invisible coded data being printed by the same printer is described in the parent case of the application, USSN 09/575,129, and thus is an allowable amendment.

In particular, USSN 09/575,129 describes the netpage printer receiving "*subscribed netpage documents from netpage publication servers 14. Each document is distributed in two parts: the page layouts, and the actual text and image objects which populate the pages. Because of personalization, page layouts are typically specific to a particular subscriber and so are pointcast to the subscriber's printer via the appropriate page server. Text and image objects, on the other hand, are typically shared with other subscribers, and so are multicast to all subscribers' printers and the appropriate page servers. The netpage publication server optimizes the segmentation of document content into pointcasts and multicasts. After receiving the pointcast of a document's page layouts, the printer knows which multicasts, if any, to listen to. Once the printer has received the complete page layouts and objects that define the document to be printed, it can print the document*" (page 26, lines 1 to 12).

Appln No. 09/721,862  
Amdt. Dated April 7, 2005  
Response to Office Action of February 10, 2005

8

Furthermore, USSN 09/575,129 (page 26) describes that the printing process consists of two decoupled stages - the rasterisation of page descriptions, and expansion and printing of page images. Rasterisation is further described on Page 72, lines 11 to 24, which clarifies that the page description are rasterised and stored, and that the data content of each tag is generated during rasterisation.

This is achieved using a tag map. In this regard, the Examiner is directed to the fact that a normal netpage printer prints netpages on sheets of paper, and although more specialised netpage printers may print onto more specialised surfaces, *"each printer supports at least one surface type, and supports at least one tag tiling scheme, and hence tag map, for each surface type. The tag map 811 which describes the tag tiling scheme actually used to print a document becomes associated with that document so that the document's tags can be correctly interpreted"* (page 26 line 26 to page 27 line 1). Hence, this further clarifies that the invisible coded data and the visible content are printed by the same printer.

USSN 09/575,129 further describes that *"printers not enabled for IR printing have the option to print tags using IR-absorptive black ink, although this restricts tags to otherwise empty areas of the page. Although such pages have more limited functionality than IR-printed pages, they are still classed as netpages"*. Thus, the same printer is capable of printing coded data and visible content.

Thus, the same printer prints the page layouts and the invisible coded data.

Hence, it is apparent from the above descriptions that the visible content and the invisible coded data are printed substantially simultaneously by the same printer, and are described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Appln No. 09/721,862  
Amdt. Dated April 7, 2005  
Response to Office Action of February 10, 2005

9

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



---

PAUL LAPSTUN



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762